

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1 and 19-23 have been amended to present the claims in better form for allowance and for possible consideration on appeal. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to accept the proposed amendments. Claims 5 and 9-12 were cancelled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-8 and 13-23 are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-8.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 19-23 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-23.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 4-8, 13 and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Camp, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,802,067 ("Camp").

Claim 1 recites:

A system comprising:

a computer system having a processor coupled with a memory, the computer system further including an application server, the application server including a unified logging and tracing system having
one or more log controllers to receive one or more messages from an application wherein each of the one or more log controllers is a Java class that includes one or more subclasses or modules selected from a group comprising a category subclass to generate log messages and a location subclass to generate trace messages;
a log manager coupled to the one or more log controllers to manage the one or more log controllers;
one or more logs to which the received messages are forwarded;
a formatter coupled to the one or more logs, the formatter to format each of the one or more messages prior to publication of the one or more messages; and
a viewer coupled to the formatter, the viewer to display the formatted one or more messages.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the reference and the pending claims. For example, Camp discloses "a computer software framework and method that provides a means to log messages to files, consoles, databases, and other destinations and combines the functions of log file formatting, message multicasting, message filtering, message severity processing and log file management." (Col. 1, lines 6-11). Now referring to part of a section referenced by the Examiner in previous Office Actions (mailed, 08-10-07, page 4, and mailed, 02-26-07, page 5), Camp further discloses "[l]og base class 15 provides a *means to format messages to obtain a consistent structure and appearance for generated logs containing the logged messages*, which helps to provide uniformity across a computing

system. In carrying out the formatting function, log base class 15 calls *a formatter, typically an object containing a method for appending additional information to the text string of the message*. Referring to FIG. 2A, formatter subclasses implement formatter interface 35. *Any type and number of formatter subclass may be used to represent information for amending a message prior to logging, and preferred formatter classes include time stamp formatter 40, severity formatter 41, application formatter 42, user formatter 43, and transaction formatter 44.*" (col. 4, lines 11-24; emphasis added)

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites "a formatter coupled to the one or more logs, the formatter to format each of the one or more messages prior to publication of the one or more messages" (emphasis added). Camp does not teach or reasonably suggest a formatter coupled to the one or more logs, the formatter to format each of the one or more messages prior to publication of the one or more messages as recited by claim 1. Nowhere does Camp disclose at least this feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 13 and 19 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 19 and their dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 2, 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Camp in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art.

Claims 2, 3 and 14 depend from one of claims 1 and 13 thus include all the

limitations of the corresponding base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 14.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

SEP 14 2007

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 14, 2007


Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980

Docket No: 6570P028
Application No.: 10/749,005